

type arrangement...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to divide the question please, the first line versus the rest.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Let me just take a look at that and see if that appears to be a logical division. Senator Wehrbein, could you come up here. I'm not sure I know exactly what you're referencing. Yeah, we had to have a little bit of conference there. The rule appears to allow for divisions in practically any case, except for one where there's a motion that strikes language and inserts new language in its place. And the rule makes it clear that that is not a divisible type of motion. So the amendment will not be divided. Senator Vrtiska, to continue debate on the motion.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. Senator Lindsay, question, please.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yes.

SENATOR VRTISKA: In listening to your discussion on the amendment that you bring forth, you made some reference to the use of previous...or did you make some use of the...some suggested use of previous studies had been done?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yes.

SENATOR VRTISKA: And those studies were done how long ago?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Well, if it's okay with you, Senator Vrtiska, I would say that the information I got before I spoke was not accurate. And the DCS...this would delay the construction of the prison. And it would...they would need the 350,000 at some point to start that process. So if we did not...we did not... The effect of this amendment would, in effect, delay the construction of that prison. Like I say, I was...did not have the proper information (inaudible).

SENATOR VRTISKA: Okay. I guess what I was trying to get to,